

5 Upper Gloucester Street,
Dorset Square.
19 Dec. 1867.

My dear Overy,

I am unable to tell you any thing
about the state of the Dulwich MSS.
I should think it unlikely that there are
two copies of that document, but the
question is one that might be put to the
person who is Librarian, Curator, or what-
ever he may call himself.

No one who has ever followed
Collier can have failed to observe that
he is, or was, an extremely inaccurate
transcriber. He probably wrote in haste,
never examined his copies, and when he
printed from ^{or except in very special cases} them never collated his proofs
with the originals. I can even suppose that
he was occasionally foolish enough, when
he found that there was some inaccuracy
in his transcripts, to add or omit a word

on ^{two} ~~these~~ by way of, as he supposed, making sense of a doubtful passage.

Another practice which it seems to me very likely that he adopted was that of making notes upon his transcripts. In cases where the transcripts were not used at the time, such notes might very well get muddled up by the printer with the copy, and might ~~not~~ pass a careful corrector undiscussed.

Another point, which was suggested to day by Thoms, and one which Collier might very well be asked, is, did he ever make his transcripts in short hand, which he afterwards elongated at a venture. That would account for the very kind of errors which seem to exist in this case.

The variations in the spelling, and the omission of the and by which the paternity of Lord Hunsdon is so strangely confused, are

all to be accounted for, as it seems to me,
by inaccuracy in transcribing and correcting
the proofs.

And it must be borne in mind that ab-
solute accuracy in this matter is very diffi-
cult of attainment. Certainly Mr. Ingley has
not attained it. With his malicious wit
sharpened by the character of his present
employment, and with his fac-simile before
him, you will yet find in his printed copy,

hæs for heäs [Habeas]

form^e for form [formal for former]

yt for yt [it for that]

about for above

and three times as many mistakes in
the improper use of the record type.

Even in the fac-simile I find that
a mistake passed the press, and was after-
wards erased with a knife, in the word
more, in the last line but one, and in the
same line there is a 10th, which, according

to the context, is clearly such in the original.
If there were the means of comparison
Doubtless other errors would be found.

Such errors are therefore not remarkable, and all that can be said about them is, that the number of them differs in proportion to the care and knowledge of the editor.

But there still remain the three cases of what we are asked to believe to be alterations, for a purpose.

The 1st from the ~~School of Athens~~ "Plays Confuted" of Gosson. I have had no means of verifying. As it is represented, it looks as if it were ^a quotation from memory.

The 2nd is the one in which Collier "proposes to find" "Thomas Lodge" in the MS., which is simply "one lodge"; therefore "it is only an inference" that the lodge here spoken of is Thomas Lodge the dramatist. "Only an inference!" why did not this candid critic tell his readers that the paper in question is one of a series of four, all printed in the Memoirs of Colley, and that in the 1st and 3rd of them (this being the 4th) it is

distinctly stated that the En name of the lodge
alluded to was Thomas, In adding the Thos
therefore Collier was not ~~then~~ foisting in a name
~~fact~~ without ground for believing that it
was the real name of the person in question. It
was his real name, and had been proved so to
be, ^{and} Collier probably wrote it as a note or
a marginal gloss upon his transcript, and
so it got into the printed copy. That such
an addition was an interpolation made with
an evil intention is simply ridiculous.

There remains the 3rd case which
consists of a change of the acquaintanceship
and the insertion of the words "as a player". I
will not endeavour to explain this. I cannot.
But it looks to me as if Collier made some
muddle in his transcript, and added the
words "as a player" by way of gloss, or addition,
and as ^{a memorandum} explanatory of the source of the ac-
quaintanceship, bearing in mind that in
1841 he had inferred that ~~he~~ ^{Lodge} was a player
from Gospor's use of the word Vagrant.

One would like to know when

these transcripts were made. If several years before they were used, the delay and consequent forgetfulness of the circumstances under which any marginal memoranda were made, would sufficiently account for their getting into the printed copy.

Probably Collier has already received a copy of this pamphlet, and when you next see him may speak to you about it. If he does not, I am inclined to think that it would be a right thing to bring it to his notice. My own belief is that a new history of the way in which these transcripts were made and subsequently printed, would constitute an answer to Mr. Ingelby, and one which candidly told by Collier, without passion, and in his calm, quiet way of writing, would do him a very great deal of good in the estimation of all who take an interest in these inquiries.

Believe me,

Always yours very sincerely,

Mo Bruce

Fredene Quory Esq^r

